UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/599,534	06/26/2007	Derk Vegter	H27204-1271.1102101	1460
90545 HONEYWELL	7590 05/07/201 <b>/CS</b> T	EXAMINER		
Patent Services 101 Columbia F		AMRANY, ADI		
P.O. Box 2245	Coau	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
Morristown, NJ	07962-2245	2836		
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			05/07/2010	ELECTRONIC

## Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

patentservices-us@honeywell.com honeywell\_uspto@cstlaw.com shelley.herndon@honeywell.com

## Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
10/599,534	VEGTER, DERK	
Examiner	Art Unit	

	ADI AMRANY	2836	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED <u>23 April 2010</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS APP	LICATION IN CONDITION FOR AL	LOWANCE.	
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Apperent for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 Comperiods:	the same day as filing a Notice of A replies: (1) an amendment, affidavited al (with appeal fee) in compliance	Appeal. To avoid abar ., or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or	hich places the (3) a Request
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Ar no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire la Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (i) MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f)	dvisory Action, or (2) the date set forth the ter than SIX MONTHS from the mailing b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE	g date of the final rejection	n.
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date of have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL	on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.1 ension and the corresponding amount of hortened statutory period for reply origi	of the fee. The appropria nally set in the final Offic	ate extension fee e action; or (2) as
2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in complifiling the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed wi	sion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the	
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, b  (a) They raise new issues that would require further cor  (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below  (c) They are not deemed to place the application in better appeal; and/or	nsideration and/or search (see NOT w);	E below);	
(d) They present additional claims without canceling a converge NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).  4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12	21. See attached Notice of Non-Cor		PTOL-324).
<ol> <li>Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):</li> <li>Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s).</li> </ol>		imely filed amendmer	nt canceling the
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) [ how the new or amended claims would be rejected is prov The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: 9. Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: 1-8 and 10-20. Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:		be entered and an e	xplanation of
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE			
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).</li> </ol>	l sufficient reasons why the affidavi	t or other evidence is	necessary and
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to of showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea	l and/or appellant fail:	s to provide a
10. $\square$ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation	n of the status of the claims after er	ntry is below or attach	ed.
<ul> <li>REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER</li> <li>11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but See Continuation Sheet.</li> </ul>	does NOT place the application in	condition for allowan	ce because:
12. Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i> (s). (13. Other:	PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)		
	/Stephen W Jackson/ Primary Examiner, Art U	nit 2836	

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Regarding claim 16, the claim recites, "providing a direction current (dc) control voltage that is SUITABLE for opening the gas valve" (emphasis added). Auer discloses that the alternating frequencies cause the capacitors (161, 162) to charge/discharge in order to maintain current flowing through the upper/lower windings of the relay, thereby keeping it open. Thus, Auer meets the limitation of providing a "suitable" control voltage. Support for this interpretation is also found in figure 2, which shows the direction of current through the windings of the relay. Both windings have current flowing from left to right, thereby creating a voltage drop across the winding (since it would be obvious that the winding has resistance and V=IR). And since the control voltage is maintained so long as the frequencies alternate, Auer meets the limitation of "maintaining" the control voltage as well.

Regarding claims 1 and 12, Auer meets the amended limitations, as discussed above. Further, the output terminals can also be interpreted as the terminals of the relay (125) itself. Auer discloses that current flow in maintained through the relay (thereby creating a voltage drop) when the frequencies alternate properly.

The Double Patenting rejection of claims 1-8 and 10-15 is maintained.

Claim 9 remains allowable, as it recites limitations regarding the specific placement of the internal components of the fail-safe circuit. Claims 1, 12 and 16 only broadly recite applying a control voltage. There are no limitations in these claims regarding how the control voltage is actually applied to the gas valve (as in claim 9).